Dear Walter, 5/1/78

It is that beautiful time in which ~~xxxxx~~ blooms are burst on the flowering trees and shrubs and the early flowers are gaudy, the time or renewing life. It is also a day that permits some outdoor activity for me, one on which I can continue my own renewal efforts because so many muscles have atrophied and because activity promotes circulation now diminished more than as of the time we were last in touch.

Typing is something I can do while I rest. After physical activity I must rest now. This is not only because I tire easily, which I do. It is because of something that may interest the lexicographer in you.

After this and another explanation I will go out and do some earth mowing. Then I will read and comment on what Dr. Humphrey Osmond has written. (I am glad to have it, thanks.)

Last summer I got so weak I could not walk out to the end of the lane and back without some dizziness. I went outside my medical insurance, was able to make an appointment with a top specialist, and then got a bill from him - with the sum missing.

Lil and I were both fascinated by these words in the bill:"subclavian steal."

We both knew the clavicle is the shoulder bone. But "Steal" in a diagnosis?

So Lil wrote the man, chief of surgery at Georgetown and Nixon's consultant, told him that if he'd tell us how much we owe him we'd pay promptly, as we asked him to explain "subclavian steal."

We received a bill on which he wrote that this meant there was an "embarrassment" to or in an artery.

"Steal" and "embarrassment" both in a diagnosis relating to the circulatory system?

So I asked Jim Lesar, whose wife is a doctor. (Radiologist.) He told me that she told him to consult one of her medical texts.

As I recall what he later told me it seems that when the brain receives an inadequate supply of blood by the means intended it "steals" the blood it requires, meaning from another source or vessel.

To describe this as a mere "embarrassment" would delight me were it not so serious.

It means that among other things I sometimes can't stop yawning for air when I'm otherwise wide awake, and this can be a real embarrassment.

To try to prevent other such embarrassments I go out and work even when I do not feel like it, like now, to compel the circulatory system to work and to attempt to stretch the vessels by loading them up. I also hope that this will enlarge the minor vessels, as has happened to the legs, visibly, from ~~xxxxxx~~ walking.

The other explanation has several parts. One may appear egotistical but I think it isn't. I've done so much of the basic work in the field I have learned from experience to begin with doubts about the work of others if they do not consult my work. (Neither Jerry Agel nor his collaborator nor Frank McEnany nor Osmond did.) The second reflects what I have come to deplore, the irrelevance of fact.

Thus the bumblebee can't fly, bugs can't live in water and look what happened to Galileo!

These are fairies and needles people.

And they are the one for whom literary acceptability waits.

I stopped when I'd read "As the co-author of a play..." for the first reason above. Then my eye was taken by your note at the bottom. When I read it I learned "line missing." But then I saw "However, the resistance to Jerome Agel's brilliant rethinking of," which is where the first page ends.

The date is 4/15/78. Osmond says "(~~xxxx~~ Prompted by Diane Judge column, NY Post 4/11/" and the rest is eliminated in the xeroxing. Do you have a copy of her column? I'd like all of this horseshit for the archive I've begun to deposit.

There is no wonder there is so much mental ilness if the sick of mind treat those who made are sick. Osmond is sick. He is a physicrtric - who cannot heal himself.

Save for the fact that JFK was killed there is no single accurate statement in all this ego-tripping, including in the field of his supposed expertise. I have and have read the transcript of the session the Commission staff and a member or two had with those crazy shrinks. One in particular was wedded to a theory he had developed and was so obvious in contorting all to that that the lawyers tore him apart. Politely. Nothing was tenable. If it had been some of the Commission's problems might have been solved.

This character talks about "psychiatric evidence" and about Oswald's alleged hatred of women "(as subsequent research has fully substantiated)" for all the world although either existed in any form that a modestly intelligent layman could call "evidence."

As one of many examples of the galloping stupidity of all of this there is his representation that the FBI's ballistic people came up with certain proofs and that the rifle could not have hit Jackie. Both are false. The rifle could have hit anything within its range and if the proofs Osmond describes as "ballistics" (and is not) were as he represents, why do I still have the FBI in court on this after more than a decade of effort to obtain the test results? Would they not have had it on all front pages? On the networks?

Osmond fabricates as he needs to in order to believe his own baseless theorizing. Yet he pontificates about others as conspiracy theorists. The craziest of those that I've seen makes more sense than he does.

This gets me back to the beginning. No knowledge is necessary. Ignorance is essential. Sublime in the mixed juices of ego and ignorance there is no limit to ~~the~~ what the Osmonds and others can (and do) come up with.

All these wretched things by so many self-important ones are sickening.

What Osmond says about publishing and this subject should give you enough factual basis for evaluating his judgements and his representations of fact. It is opposite the fact.

He is no better on Hiss but I'm not going to go farther than note that without having read the book supposedly reviewed he describes the review as both good and fair. (Where the shrinks had something to work on in that case is Chambers.)

I'm sorry this is an incomplete copy. I think it is a valuable addition to the records that others may study in the future. It says much about our present society, too, and about those who are influential in various ways.

I'm interested in what he calls "Marc Jaffe's theory of a "conspiracy of silence."" It is incomprehensible in this copy if it is anywhere to one who does not know what he is talking about.

Osmond only began to invent when he coined the word "psychedelic."

I hope he is not one you like or respect. I fear for the patients of this man who plays God so poorly.

He, Jerry and others like them do what they cannot, I am sure, conceive, Big Brother's dirty work. Jerry's is so utterly worthless that I remember nothing about it except the ballpark - and Jerry is not even in it. In a kinder view, neither could have qualified himself for any responsible writing because of the time required to learn enough about the crime itself that is truthful or factual.

What is much more interesting to me now, if you see or hear anything about it, is the Readers Digest operation involving Epstein, titled Legend. For all practical purposes it is at once a CIA "black book" (remember Romero?) and an attack on the present CIA by the paranoidal Angletonians who were forced out of it.

By and large things are as they were save that I'm swamped in paper. I've obtained 100,000 pages of the FBI HQ JFK files and expect not fewer than this many more in coming months besides whatever I can expect from a number of ongoing suits for other records. In this, without publicity or seeking it, Jim and I are establishing new FOIA precedents. It keeps us both too busy. I can't find time to write. In fact I can't find time to serve a consultancy to the Department of Justice, which has qualified me as knowing more about both the JFK and MLK assassinations than anyone in the FBI. Thanks and our best to you both,